

It may be supposed that I was too much interested in knowing what had passed at the Tuileries not to return to the Duc de Rovigo the same day. I learned from him the particulars which I have already related. He added that he had observed to the Emperor that there was no connection between Eapp and M. de Talleyrand which could warrant the suspicion of their being concerned in the affair in question. "When Napoleon saw the matter in its true light," said Savary, "when I proved to him the palpable existence of the odious machination, he could not find terms to express his indignation. 'What baseness, what horrible villany!' he exclaimed; and gave me orders to arrest and bring to Paris the infamous writer of the letter; and you may rely upon it his orders shall be promptly obeyed."

Savary, as he had said, instantly despatched orders for the arrest of the writer, whom he directed to be sent to Franc*. On his arrival he was interrogated respecting the letter. He declared that he had written it at the instigation and under the dictation of Marshal Davoust,¹ for doing which he received a small sum of money as a reward.² He also confessed that when the letter was put into the post the Prince of Eckmühl ordered the Director of the Post to open it, take a copy, then seal it again, and send it to its address — that is to say, to me — and the copy to the Emperor. The writer of the letter was banished to Marseilles, or to the Island of Hyères, but the individual who dictated it continued a Marshal, a Prince, and a Governor-General, and still looked

¹The explanation of these attacks on Davoust (more properly spelt Davout), has already been given in the note on the demand made on Bourrienne on his return from Hamburg. The subject is treated at length by the Marshal's son in *Erreurs*, tome ii. p. 225. Davoust was at Paris on leave, and had not even been to Hamburg when Napoleon first called on him for information about Bourrienne's peculations, and the first reports against Bourrienne, made in reply to the Emperor's questions, were furnished by the Marshal's Chief of the Staff, and simply forwarded by him. The letters of Davoust seem to show no special ill will towards Bourrienne, and it would be difficult to find any reason for a man in Davoust's high position intriguing against the ex-Secretary. The Comte Alexandre de Puymaigre (*Souvenirs*, p. 135), not very favorably disposed towards Davoust, speaks to the general and strong belief at Hamburg that Bourrienne had made large sums of money there improperly.

² It does not appear at all clear why credence should be given to the informer's statement in the latter case any more than the former.